

REMARKS

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 19 and 25 under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are clear, and reconsideration of the claims as presented herein is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-34 under 35 USC Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Sheynblat. In view of the following comments, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "wherein a location token requesting location information corresponding to the client device is transmitted between the client device and the server device." Claim 7 recites, "an other device generating a first response to the request, the first response including a first location token requesting location information corresponding to the client device." Claim 19 recites "a client device generating and transmitting a request for information, the request including a first location token requesting location information corresponding to the client device; an other device generating a response to the request, the response including a second location token." Claim 25 recites "transmitting a first location token between the client device, the other device and the intermediary requesting insertion of location information corresponding to the client device."

The Examiner indicates that Sheynblat discloses a token in column 8. However, Sheynblat merely discloses in these lines that a request for a location determination action may occur when a user dials 911. Sheynblat is directed to providing the location of the device, and not to providing a location token to be populated with information. There is no disclosure regarding a location token being transmitted between the client device and another device in Sheynblat as respectively defined in the respective claims. Accordingly, Sheynblat can not anticipate the claimed invention and render it unpatentable.

Claim 2 recites "wherein the location information is populated within the location token as it is communicated through the network." The Examiner states that column 8, lines 15-18 discloses populating a location token as it is communicated through the network. Column 8 merely discloses a GPS location server is connected to a network of GPS reference stations. There is no description of either a token or populating a token as it is communicated as defined in the claim.

Claim 3 recites “wherein the location token includes signature codes corresponding to location information inserted within the location token.” Claims 11, 15, 24 and 26 also recite signatures. The Examiner points to the description at column 22, lines 15-32. These lines discuss PN codes from pseudolites. These codes are used to identify the transmitters of the GPS information to the client device. They are not signatures placed into a location token as claimed.

Claim 4 recites “the location information is incrementally inserted by one or more intermediaries.” The Examiner states that column 8, lines 37-62 discloses this. However, the prior art discusses the determining or refining of the device location using GPS information. Sheynblat discloses the mobile device sends location data to the location server, which then determines the location based on this location data. The result is the determined location of the device. Claim 4 defines a device that sends a request for information and wherein location information is inserted into a token by intermediaries as the token is communicated through the network. Sheynblat is devoid of such structure.

Claim 5 recites, “the intermediaries including a first intermediary and a second intermediary, wherein a plurality of intermediaries other than the first and the second intermediary are between the first and the second intermediary, and wherein the location information is inserted as the token is communicated through the network in both directions between the first intermediary and the second intermediary by one or more of the plurality of intermediaries.” In Sheynblat, the location information is communicated directly between the location server and the client. The location server obtains reference information from the GPS network, but this data is not related added to a token as defined.

Claim 7 defines “a client device generating and transmitting a request for information; and an other device generating a first response to the request, the first response including a first location token requesting location information corresponding to the client device.” Sheynblat discloses a device wherein the location is requested from the location server. There is no description of a location token being sent through the network to the device in response to a request for information from a device as defined in claim 7.

With respect to claims 9- 12, 14, 15, 18-22, 24, and 27- 34, it is respectfully submitted that there is no description of a first token, let alone a second token, in Sheynblat. Accordingly, Sheynblat can not anticipate these claims.

Claims 35 through 40 further define the token, and are supported at least from the bottom of page 4 through the top of page 5 of the specification. The claims are added to reinforce that the Examiner has not identified a token, and can not point to recitations in the specification that describe the contents of a token.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims clearly define the invention and to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Jano, Bashar et al.

BY:Randall S. Vaas/ 7-3-2006
Randall S. Vaas Date
Registration No. 34,479
Phone (847) 523-2327
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350